



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

but referable to different genders in Latin. On account of the likeness of ending the words oscillate in gender. Such suffixes are *-aticum* and *-aginem*=age, *entium* and *entia*=-ence, etc.

On p. 34, *pistace* is erroneously cited as influenced by such words as *dédicace*, *préface*. The correct and only form of the word is *pistache*, cf. Littré, the Dictionary of the Academy, etc. The fem. gender of *mer* our author, following Meyer, explains as a result of the same influence as is shown in the Span. phrase, *andar la tierra y la mar* for *andar la tierra y lo mar*. The period in which the gender of all these words was fixed, seems to have been the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a time when so many other artificial discriminations in French grammar were made.

The monograph as a whole brings out nothing new, but is a very handy compilation of what had been stated by the author's predecessors, especially Tobler, Mussafia, W. Meyer, and Littré, among later writers, and Marot and Palsgrave, among the older; and most of his references are taken from their writings. It should be said, however, by way of explanation, that the present brochure contains only a part of the author's doctor-dissertation.

J. E. MATZKE.

Johns Hopkins University.

WHITNEY'S FRENCH GRAMMAR.

A Practical French Grammar; with Exercises and Illustrative Sentences from French Authors, by WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology and Instructor in Modern Languages in Yale College. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1886, 12mo, pp. xiii, 442.

In the making of text-books, no less than in the other and more general relations of life, it is felt to be a truism that *noblesse oblige*; and the production of a practical grammar of so widely studied a language as French, by the most distinguished of American philologists, will naturally be looked to as promising a notable exemplification of the principle. High expectations are warrantably aroused; serious

scrutiny and earnest criticism are accorded as a matter of right.

From the first step in the examination of the merits and defects of the volume before us—which, as Professor Whitney states, has been the outcome of the author's experience as a teacher of French during many years in one of the departments of Yale College—the conclusion will constantly press for recognition that the labor bestowed in the preparation of this book can scarcely be regarded as in any sense a labor of love, much less as the fruit of wide and special knowledge. A curious illustration of the author's attitude towards what may be called the literature of his subject, is given at the close of the preface: "The grammars of which most use has been made in the preparation of this one are that of Meissner (of which there is a re-working in English, under the name of 'French Syntax,' by Professor J. A. Harrison—a valuable work, especially for teachers) and that of Ploetz." Not to speak of Professor Whitney's willingness to leave out of the account such practical grammars as those of Lücking and Plattner, what must not be the surprise of the venerable Nestor of living grammarians and lexicographers, Dr. Mätzner, of Berlin, to find himself thus confused by Professor Whitney with Mätzner's friend and admirer of a younger generation, Prof. Meissner, of Belfast? There is no desire to exaggerate the significance of such a slip,¹ though it is safe to assume that, where a question of Sanskrit was involved, no such mistaken interchange of names could have been made by the author in the analogous case, for example, of Wilson (H. H.) and Williams (Monier)! But, unfortunately, the confusion does not stop with the mere names, for the passage quoted implies that Professor Harrison's 'French Syntax' is a re-working of Mätzner's well-known 'Französische Grammatik,' rather than of the latter's long since "vergriffene" 'Französische Syntax.' Would it not, again, in all reasonableness, have been fairer to teachers of the present day who happen to be in need of any such information at all (they are fewer, perhaps, than the author imagines), if so respected a guide as Professor Whitney, instead of men-

¹ It has been silently rectified in later impressions of the Grammar.

tioning only Brachet's Grammar and Etymological Dictionary as aids to philological study (p. 203), had been disposed to help them a step forward, by intimating that Brachet's Historical Grammar, while still serviceable, has been variously supplanted, in recent years, by convenient hand-books and works of reference?

It is much to be regretted, also, that the burning question which bears upon the proper place of practical and theoretical phonetics in the elementary teaching of modern languages, should not have been at least broached by Professor Whitney, either in his preface, or in the preliminary chapter on pronunciation. "Different teachers will make different use of the chapter [on pronunciation] in instruction, according to their various training and habit;" yet the introduction of a brief series of systematically arranged practical *exercises* in pronunciation, which teachers of whatever training or habit could and should have been earnestly recommended to apply frequently, faithfully and vivaciously for the first few weeks with beginners, would have simplified matters in a most important degree. In regard to accuracy, we are most justly told that distinct statements as to the facts of pronunciation are required for the guidance of pupils, and are of no small value to the teacher also, unless he have enjoyed very exceptional advantages; but some of the most important statements on the subject are so misleading as to prove an embarrassment rather than an assistance, especially to the "great majority of teachers not French by birth or education." In this respect, the grammar falls far short of the corresponding preliminary chapter in Ploetz. Thus, for example, under the vowel *a* (p. 4), the words *la* and *a* are grouped with *cas* and *bras*, as examples of "very nearly the full open sound of the English *a* in *far* or *father*; while *âme* and *pâte* are given along with *ami* and *animal*, as illustrations of the rule that "elsewhere, *a* is a little flattened, like English *a* in *flat*, *cap*, *jack*, only not quite so much so."—"The sound [of 'mute' or 'silent' *e*] is quite precisely that in English *the* before a consonant in real colloquial utterance: thus, 'tell us *the* name of *the* man,'" *re-gard* and *re-le-va* are given as examples (p. 5), but the difference between the *e* in *regard* (and the first *e* in *releval*)

and that in the colloquially uttered English *the* is marked and important. In fact, English speaking pupils, are, in books, and by teachers who have learned from books, generally taught to slight too much rather than too little the French *e* in such a situation. The vowel *i* is said (p. 8) to have in French "invariably the sound of English 'long *e*,' or of *i* in the words *machine*, *pique*;" and "the error of pronouncing a French *i* anywhere like the English 'short *i*' of *pin*, *finish*, and the like, must be very carefully avoided." But Frenchmen will scarcely differ as to the fact that the *i* of *triste* is nearer to the *i* in *pin* than to that in *machine*. In other words, the *i* in *triste* is short, the *i* in *machine* long, and the distinction, in general, between 'long' and 'short' is one which Professor Whitney altogether too much obscures; while in regard to quality, no difference is recognized between *eu fermé*, as in *peu*, and *eu ouvert*, as in *œuvre* (p. 11), to say nothing of their difference in quantity.

Throughout the first part of the Grammar, the author has introduced occasional philological observations of the briefest sort, in fine type. With that grim fatality which inevitably overtakes the superficial, and which ought to warn the learned, at least, against hazarding statements outside the range of their own science, Professor Whitney's very first venture in this field (Lesson I., p. 29) is an unfortunate error such as he would probably have been spared making by merely turning the pages of any Old or Middle French text, with a view to ascertaining whether the facts of the language bear out his supposed explanation. After attention has been called to the insertion of a euphonic *t* between the 3d pers. sing. of a verb ending in a vowel and its following pronoun, the statement is made that "this *t* is that of the 3d sing. in Latin: thus, *a-t-il* is *habet ille*." The final *t*, however, of the 3d sing. in the present of *avoir*, and in verbs of the first conjugation, disappeared early, and for several centuries the French language permitted hiatus before a following pronoun, e. g., *a il*, *aime on*, etc., the subsequent insertion of *t* being a late phenomenon due to analogy (*est-il*, *part-il*, *dit-on*, etc.).—On p. 63 (*a*), it is said that "the infinitive (disputed), participles, and imperfect come from the corresponding forms of *stare*,

stand." It is so long since it was disputed that *être* comes from *essere*, for *esse* (instead of from *stare*), that younger scholars cannot remember the time.—Again (p. 127, §4 b) we are told that "*on* is by origin an abbreviation of *homme*," which should read, "*on* is by origin Lat. *homo* (*homme* being Lat. *hominem*)."—These scattered philological remarks in Part I. occupy, all told, some seventy lines.

To the Second Part is prefixed a chapter of six pages on the "Relation of French to Latin." If this be allowed to be a fair proportion of space to devote to the historical aspects of the language in a practical grammar, no fault can be found with the extreme meagreness of treatment; but here again errors crop out: e. g., *aimèrent*, *amavèrent* is given as an illustration of the statement that the accented syllable of the Latin word is the last fully pronounced syllable of the French word. This example, as here given, involves the double mistake of supposing that Lat. tonic *ē* gives French *è*, and that the 3d pl. of the Lat. perf. preserved its long penult, whereas it shifted its accent to the preceding syllable (*amā[ve]runt*=*aimèrent*). The first of these errors reappears, in the same list, in the example *cruel*, *crudēlem* (read **crudalem*, or better, omit this example). Indeed, as Professor Whitney himself naively remarks apropos of another phenomenon (p. 208, 6a), some of the facts of French philology are "very curious."—On p. 207(c), appears again the erroneous statement of the survival of Lat. final *t* in such examples as *a-t-il*.

Turning to the more practical side of the Grammar, one of the first points calling for remark is the entire omission, under the rules for the position of the adjective (pp. 51 and 236) of the convenient statement for beginners, that adjectives of nationality and participial adjectives regularly follow the noun. The whole treatment of the subject, moreover, would have been singularly simplified by a brief elucidation of the fundamental principle involved: viz., that adjectives employed *affectionally* (emotionally) precede the noun, while those used in the way of a purely *intellectual* attribution, follow it (compare *mon cher ami* with *un livre cher*). In all of his discourse about "an adjective used more appositively, or having a

special prominence or emphasis, or signifying something brought forward as new rather than referred to as already understood" (p. 51), and about "a physical meaning rather than an ideal or moral one, and a literal rather than a figurative" (p. 236), Professor Whitney is altogether wide of the mark.—P. 77, 7a, "The French never says, in dates or elsewhere, *eighteen hundred* and so on, but always (a) *thousand eight hundred*, etc." Comment is uncalled for.—P. 118(c), *que de services il m'a rendus*, is mistranslated: 'what services,' etc., (instead of 'how many services,' etc.). This is not a mere oversight, for the same error is repeated p. 336 (§194 c), "*que de choses j'ai vues*, 'what things I have seen!'"—P. 127(4a), "Instead of *on* simply, *l'on* (with the article prefixed) is often used after a vowel sound, especially after *et*, *ou*, *où*, *que*, *si* : thus, *si l'on voit, if one sees*." Add, "unless the following word begins with *l*: as, *si on le voit*."—P. 138(c), "Of the intransitives used reflexively, the most noteworthy is *s'en aller*, *go away*, *clear out*, *be off with one's self* (literally, *go one's self from it*)." This literal rendering is distinctly misleading, since, if it conveys any meaning, it implies that the verb is used transitively and that the reflexive pronoun is its direct object, whereas the pronoun is here, as elsewhere with intransitive verbs, an indirect dative, partaking somewhat of the nature of a *dativus commodi* (rather than of a *dativus ethicus*), and answering very closely and instructively to the use of the Greek Middle. Exception may fairly be taken, also, to translating *en*, thus idiomatically used with verbs of motion, as 'from it,' since the *en* is here purely adverbial (*inde*, 'thence') and in this use has never undergone substitution for the genitive case of the personal pronoun. The pupil should be taught to discriminate between the adverbial and the pronominal uses of *en* and *y*, and it is confusing to find given as an example of the use of the "genitive pronoun *en*" (p. 302 h), "*il était à la campagne; il en revient aujourd'hui*," by the side of '*usez-en, mais n'en abusez pas*.'—P. 176 (§4 b), "The pres. subj. is used in good wishes for English *long live*: thus, *vive le roi*, 'long live the king.' In the expression *qui vive*, 'who goes there?' (literally, *who is alive* or *stirring*) it is treated as an indicative."

This is really inexcusable. Does Professor Whitney soberly imagine that French subjunctives can be juggled with ("treated," to use his own expression, which is a good one) in this way? His own paragraph affords the key to the situation. The sentinel calls out: *Qui vive?* 'Long live who?' ('For whom do you shout *vive*?') 'Whose side are you on?') The person challenged replies: *Vive le roi*; or *vive la jacquerie* or *la fronde*, as the case may be.—Insufficient rules having been given on the use of capitals, we read, p. 178 (Ex. 38, sentences 12 and 15), "Si votre frère va en Angleterre, il lui faudra apprendre l'Anglais." "Comprenez-vous l'Allemand, mademoiselle?"—P. 226 (§42 e), "The plural article is, in a higher narrative style, often put before the name of an individual, to mark him as a person of note and importance: thus, *les Bossuet et les Racine ont été la gloire de leur siècle*, 'Bossuet and Racine were the glory of their century.' Can Professor Whitney mean, as his language and rendering seem plainly to imply, that the plural article here indicates a sort of *pluratis maiestaticus*, rather than simply 'the Bossuets and the Racines,' by a familiar figure of speech?—In the treatment of the tenses (pp. 264-8), the preterit is in no way characterized as the *historical* tense, nor is the contrast brought out between the use of the preterit as marking the leading events of an historical narration, and that of the imperfect, as introducing its accessory features.—P. 274 (§133), the use of *il semble* with the subjunctive is noted, but nothing is said of *il me semble* with the indicative, although an example of this latter use is given in the illustrative sentences (p. 276, 10).—P. 282 (§139 a), "In familiar speech, especially, the use of an imperfect subjunctive, is strictly avoided, by various devices, and in part by putting the present in its place." The reservation should have been made that, even in familiar speech, it is only the unepiphonious imperfect subjunctives in *-asse* and *-usse* that are "strictly avoided."—Under the treatment of the negation, no mention is made of the construction *ne—ni ne*, although a sentence requiring it is given for translation ('I neither admire her nor love her,' p. 312, 17).—P. 308, §169, it is said that *non* "may be followed by the second

negative *pas* (not by *point*)." *Non point* is of frequent occurrence.—P. 308, §169 d, "*Non* had formerly the office of directly making a verb negative, and is sometimes still found so used, in antiquated style: thus, *non ferai-je*, 'I shall not do.'" *Non* survives, in this use, *solely* with the verb *faire*, and *non ferai-je* means 'No, I shall not' (the *ferai* being a substitute for whatever idea is negated, e. g., 'go,' 'stay'). This construction is the negative counterpart of the much more frequently occurring *si fait*, literally, 'yes he does,' (the form of the 3d person having crowded out the others). The latter phrase—which is not given (cf. p. 341, §200 b)—is much better entitled to mention in a practical grammar than the other.

A closing chapter is devoted to French Versification. It falls into the lamentable error not only of denying the melodious and exceedingly varied *accentual principle* of French verse, but even of ignoring the existence of the *caesura*! No wonder that English-speaking students find difficulty in recognizing and appreciating the rhythm of French poetry, when they are taught that "a French line of verse is only a certain number of successive syllables, with a rhyme at the end" (p. 354, §.232).

Teachers, then, will have many an erroneous precept and impression to counteract, in using this grammar with their pupils. Yet, after so many strictures, it is a pleasure, as well as simple justice, to turn to a more grateful aspect of the critic's functions, and cordially to recognize in the book many excellencies that have laid all instructors of elementary French in this country under real and present, if, as we may desire and hope, only temporary obligations. With the exception of the exercises—which have evidently been prepared by a novice (cf. such English as 'He will be able, if you shall be able,' p. 121, 10, 'It is very long that his friends have not seen him,' p. 312, 9)—the grammar displays on every page abundant evidence of Professor Whitney's careful and experienced manipulation. Part I. is simple and progressive, and above all treats the pronouns and the irregular verbs in a compact and sensible manner. It furnishes a convenient and sufficiently complete handbook to the French accidence, with a fair share of the

necessary appliances for drill and practice. Part II. supplies a desideratum long felt, especially for college classes, in affording a systematic and, within certain limits, scholarly compend of the leading facts of French grammar. While scarcely categorical enough for easy use by younger pupils, Professor Whitney's presentation of the doctrine of the subjunctive, for example, and of the infinitive, may be pointed to as comparing favorably, both in spirit and manner, with corresponding passages in his incomparable Sanskrit grammar. The idea of the Illustrative Sentences from French authors, in this part, is in itself a good one, though sometimes carried out with questionable judgment. The sentences given are too often provokingly in need of a context, while the introduction of such an antiquated specimen as '*J'ai ouï dire à feu ma sœur que sa fille et moi naquîmes la même année,*' to illustrate a simple point in grammar (the use of *feu*), is not edifying in an elementary work. It shows that the range of three centuries allowed in the choice of examples, may be made to seem too wide.

There is an excellent system of references for words irregular or peculiar in pronunciation; the vocabularies and indexes are refreshingly complete (*concert* is wanting, to cover sentence 18, p. 134), and misprints are admirably few (but cf. l'abbà de Sainte Gènevieve, p. 237, 4, and read §131*a* instead of §131*a*, p. 429, 2d col., under 'so,' l. 4). Professor Whitney's philological sense has stood him in good stead in the matter of rejecting exploded etymologies and in using the question-mark for doubtful cases (yet *hoc illud* is given for *ouï*; and *per-ustum*, for *brûler*, should have a ?). The book is attractively printed, on good paper and with clear type. It is to be hoped that teachers of French, whether in or out of college, will for the present consider this the very best of grammars in English for use in their elementary classes.

One more serious word remains: let it be spoken frankly, yet with all the consideration due from the beginner to the veteran. There is a regret which the fraternity of French scholars may justly feel entitled to indulge with regard to Professor Whitney. It is, that after many years' teaching of French in one of

our foremost universities, and even when about to write a grammar of the French language, he, with all his royal training and capabilities, should not have felt a sufficiently intelligent interest in the subject of French philology, to find himself impelled to look about him, and to inform himself of the status and results of this subtle, broad and vigorous science.

H. A. TODD.

York Plays. The Plays Performed by the Crafts or Mysteries of York, on the day of Corpus Christi, in the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Centuries. Now first Printed from the Unique Manuscript in the Library of Lord Ashburnham. Edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by LUCY TOULMIN SMITH, Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1885. 8vo, pp. lxxviii+557.

Abraham and Isaac. A Norfolk Mystery, edited from the Brome Hall Manuscript by LUCY TOULMIN SMITH. Anglia, Band vii., Heft 3, 1884, pp. 316-337.

To say that the works above noted are the first really serviceable editions of English Mysteries yet produced may seem to imply a harsh judgment of precedent work; and yet the statement is true. We have had the records of erratic and unrelated research in the works of Sharp, Marriott, and Warton; we have had also the diverting narratives of explorations of Hone and Disraeli; and we have had the very good second-hand summaries of Morley, Collier and Ward. But, for the scholar's use, all of the works above noted, excellent as they are for certain purposes, are most inadequate, and exasperation succeeds to hope when one attempts to use them as assistants to any real investigation. One needs such careful studies as those of Sepet, Klein, de Julleville and Ebert, and they are not at hand. Even the editions of the Miracle Play Cycles that we have—the Townley plays, edited with laborious ineptitude by Mr. Stevenson, the Coventry plays by Mr. Halliwell, and the Chester series, edited (with much plum-plucking of collateral matter from

¹ The Cornish plays have been well edited by Mr. Whitley Stokes.